

### REMARKS

Claims 1 to 14 are in the application.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the Examiner will note that the claims have been amended to correct the passages considered indefinite.

Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

As a result of the foregoing Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to set forth the pressure booster in more detail. Specifically, it is now mentioned in claim 1 that the pressure booster is comprised of a high pressure piston (18) and a low pressure piston (22), wherein the low pressure piston (22) is mounted in a first low pressure chamber (36), and, by switching a switching valve (26), is cooled from the pressure generator (2) or tank pressure. Support for this Amendment to claim 1 can be found in the first full paragraph on page 11 and the paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12 of the specification as originally filed.

Accordingly, no new matter has been added as a result of the Amendments to claim 1.

The Examiner has now rejected claims 1 to 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iversen.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The newly cited reference to Iversen merely shows a pressure booster to which pressure is admitted through an inlet P.

The present invention differs from this reference in that the pressure booster required for producing the pressure P is connected as a unit to the pressure booster; in other words, a rigid connection is formed between the pressure booster and the pressure generator.

Since such a pressure generator, which is rigidly connected to the pressure booster, and thus forms a unit, is not disclosed by the reference to Iversen, the reference does not anticipate the present invention as claimed.

The reference to Iversen also does not suggest the present invention because the reference does not provide any indication for modifying the pressure booster described in the reference by adding a pressure generator for producing the pressure P.

Claims 1 to 9 and 12 are again rejected as anticipated by Anaker.

The reference to Anaker discloses altogether three pumps, namely a low pressure pump (10), a low pressure pump (28) and a high pressure pump (27).

The low pressure pump (28) and the high pressure pump (27) are driven by a common shaft 54. Consequently, the reference does not meet the limitation added with the Amendment dated October 15, 2007, according to which the drive of the high pressure pump 27 is effected by a portion of the fluid which is conveyed by the low pressure pump (28).

This is because the only purpose of the low pressure pump (28) is to supply fluid to the high pressure pump (27); the purpose of the pump (28) is not to drive the high pressure

pump (27). The drive of the high pressure pump (27) is exclusively effected by the motor (26).

The low pressure pump (10), on the other hand, does not form a unit with the pressure booster (13); in other words, the pump (10) is not rigidly connected to the pressure booster, but rather only through lines, as is known in the art.

Even if it were assumed that a rigid connection existed between the pump (10) and the pressure booster (13) (which is not disclosed) then the low pressure pump (10) would not drive the pressure booster with a portion of the fluid; rather, the entire conveyed quantity of the fluid would be used. This is because the reference to Anaker does not provide a path for conducting the fluid conveyed by the pump 10 past the hydraulic motor (26). Rather, all fluid which is supplied through the line (20) is once again removed through the line (21) in order to prevent mixing of the fluid (11) with the fluid (24) in the housing of the hydraulic pressure booster (13).

Consequently, the features of claim 1 of the present application are novel as compared to the reference to Anaker.

The reference to Anaker clearly does not show the high pressure pump (27) being driven by a portion of a fluid which is conveyed by the low pressure pump (28) or the low pressure pump (10).

The reference to Anaker also does not provide any indication for modifying its arrangement including low pressure pump and pressure booster in such a way that the pressure booster is rigidly connected to a pump.

Accordingly, the present invention is also not disclosed or suggested by the reference to Anaker.

As mentioned above, claim 1 has been amended to set forth the individual elements of the pressure booster.


While the Examiner is of the opinion that a high pressure pump also can be considered a pressure booster, the following should be considered.

The specification of the present application mentions on page 3, lines 7 to 12, that high pressure pumps are much more expensive than a pressure booster with a differential piston. The high pressure pumps also are heavier and use more energy which is due to increased friction. When comparing the references to Anaker and Iversen, it is readily apparent that a high pressure pump (27) is technically much more complicated than the high pressure booster (2) of Iversen.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with the application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Friedrich Kueffner  
Reg. No. 29,482  
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910  
New York, N.Y. 10017  
(212) 986-3114

Dated: April 11, 2008

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 11, 2008.

By:   
Friedrich Kueffner

Date: April 11, 2008